

Draft Individual Review Form
(Note: Review comments will be anonymous, but public.)

Proposal number: 2001-I201-3

Short Proposal Title: Watershed Education –
Headwaters to the Ocean

Explain connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write “none” if no connection): [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

NONE

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Very general goals are stated including: knowledge of at risk species, ecosystems processes, harvestable species, habitats, non-native invasive species, and sediment and water quality. This section is weak – goals are not tied to anything measurable.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

There is no conceptual model identified other than project overviews. The relationship between the various project components is not clearly defined and the rationale for this mix is not provided. This section is weak.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The overall approach seems to be a mix of bird walks/observations, native grass plantings, native plant propagation, and mapping for non-native invasive plants along the river. Since the goals are so loosely defined, it would seem that the approach would accomplish them.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

This section (1c1) does not fit an environmental education proposal as well as it might other types of proposals. This project does not identify any of the above but it could include a combination of research, demonstration, and full-scale implementation.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Bird observations, depending on the reliability of the student monitoring, could be used to document and track bird populations/sightings over time. I would also estimate that depending on the accuracy of the GIS/GPS mapping of invasive species, that this information could be used by decision makers to help eradicate these species. This information was not identified in the proposal.

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

There is little information about the monitoring or assessment plans other than a timeline for project completion included in this proposal. Because of that I would rate this section as VERY weak.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

No information included about data analysis or reporting. Although education/conservation projects may not lend themselves as readily to this type of criteria, some form of evaluation needed to be included and it was not. This section is weak.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes, the work is technically feasible.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

I would estimate that the team is qualified to carry out this plan.

Miscellaneous comments

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Other than a description of the project and projected budget, very little else was included in the proposal. If careful consideration of the proposal criteria is an important factor in proposal acceptance, this proposal did not do that. Much more consideration for evaluation, measurements

of student learnings, and on-the-ground accomplishments of mapping or grass seeding could have been provided. Since this was not included, I would be cautious about funding such an expensive and generically written proposal. The cost of this proposal as compared to the benefits seems excessive.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Fair XXX <input type="checkbox"/> Poor	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating - (SEE ABOVE) [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]
--	--